

fers much fertile ground for exploration. The following chapter, ('The Nature of Roman Apamea') is an extended discussion of economy and identity politics at Phrygian Apamea through the appropriation of the Roman assizes as a local festival. T. 's discussion sets up further exploration of adjacent themes later in the volume (chapters 6 and 7) demonstrating the importance of specific local cultural contexts in assessing economic conditions in the ancient world beyond simple cost-benefit analysis. The fourth chapter ('The Fortress at Eumeneia'), takes as its subject the longevity of an Attalid fortified position near modern Işıkli. The continued recognition of this region as a liminal space regardless of political realities provides welcome fuel to the essential illogicity and cultural specificity of human-environmental interactions.

Likewise, in chapter five ('The Pastoral Economy') the interfaces between urban and rural realms illuminates an unusual level of prestige placed on animal husbandry. The textile industry, where the ability to pasture vast numbers of animals encouraged specialisation, was highly profitable. This industry, along with Imperial patronage seems to have been the most important factor for local power politics early Roman period, as is shown in chapter six ('The Nobility of Mt Cadmus'). While some families remained spatially constant, others influence and identity could spread across the region and even the wider Roman world. In the next chapter ('The Rural Economy'), T. discusses diachronic changes in estate holdings from the Hellenistic period to the early Middle ages, emphasising conflicts between monastic estates and local potentates in addition the characteristically non-contiguous nature of land holding in the region. The final chapter, ('The Bounty of the Maeander') looks at the creation of new lands in the Maeander delta. T. presents a persuasive counter-narrative to the pervasive negative interpretation of riverine accretion, demonstrating that while arable land might be damaged by the process, other economic activities, such as horse rearing, could flourish. Progradation could be as beneficial to some communities (i.e. Miletos) as it was destructive to others (i.e. Priene).

The depth and breadth of T. 's scholarship throughout is impressive, he is as comfortable discussing the landholding in archaic Miletos as 13th century CE Byzantine monastic traditions, without ever losing sight of his overarching themes. His command of the evidence, whether it be onomastic, numismatic, epigraphic or archive material is consistently of the highest quality, adding significant layers of understanding to the vignettes he presents throughout. T. recognises that neither community nor landscape can operate in a vacuum nor can they act decisively upon the other, it is within the terms of dialogue between the two that they are constituted. In this reviewer's opinion, it is this feature which makes T. 's monograph truly ground-breaking and a must-read for graduate students and scholars interested in the relationship between space and culture in the ancient world.

John Brendan Knight

ROBERT ROLLINGER: *Alexander und die großen Ströme. Die Flußüberquerungen im Lichte altorientalischer Pioniertechniken (Schwimmschläuche, Kelels und Pontonbrücken)*. Classica et Orientalia 7. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2013. ISBN 978-3-447-06927-4. XVI, 177 S., 39 Tafelseiten mit 70 Abb. EUR 38.

The crossing of great rivers has been a challenge to all armies throughout history; different solutions have been developed depending on the terrain and the circumstances. This book deals with the ques-

tion of how the army of Alexander the Great crossed the great rivers in the Near East and Central Asia. The author presents and examines a wide range of sources illustrating his subject.

First, the author draws on the evidence of Arrian and Curtius Rufus and studies how Alexander crossed the rivers Danube, Oxus, Tanais (Iaxartes), Indus, Hydaspes and Acesines and the solutions that are mentioned in the sources in terms of material and technique. He quotes the relevant passages in Greek and Latin and offers an analysis of them. The methods of crossing a river reflect on the one hand the preparations Alexander had made and on the other the army's adaptability to new situations when the intended method did not work and another solution had to be adopted, using the materials at hand. The sources emphasize Alexander's ability to find *ad hoc* solutions.

In crossing the Danube, Alexander at first used the squadron of warships which he had ordered to sail from Byzantium to the mouth of the Danube, while he himself started from Amphipolis and crossed the Balkans subjugating the Triballian and Illyrian tribes. The ships were filled with archers and heavily armed troops but were not able to land at the island of Peuce in pursuit of the Triballians because the current was swift and most of the banks of the island were too steep for landing. As the warships could thus not be used for the crossing, a special solution had to be invented. Leather tent covers were filled with hay and were used together with local boats made from single tree trunks; a force of about fifteen hundred cavalry and 4000 foot crossed the Danube with Alexander.

At the Oxus, the sources mention the river being deep and wide and the current being swift, and that, moreover, there was a lack of timber that made it impossible to build ships or a bridge. Therefore, Alexander collected the hides which were used to cover the tents and ordered them to be filled with the driest possible chaff and then to be tied down and stitched together to make them watertight. They were efficient enough to take the army across the river in five days. At the Indus, the crossing took place with the help of a bridge built by Hephaistion, whom Alexander had sent beforehand to oversee the project. There is no description of how the bridge was built, but Arrian states that many smaller ships and also two triacontors stood ready by the bridge. Arrian finds it plausible that it was a bridge made by boats anchored side by side with planks placed crosswise to bind them together. He mentions several examples of such bridge-making in the ancient world. It must be stressed that Rollinger focuses on the technical details of the crossings only, although some background information would in many cases have been useful to explain their strategic meaning, for instance, why Alexander first marched to the north and thus had to cross the Danube before moving on to the campaign against Persia.

Next, Rollinger discusses the above-mentioned evidence comparing it with other available sources, ethnographic data and evidence from Near Eastern history, making interesting observations. The manner of using hides in the ethnographic evidence from the area Alexander visited looks different from what we can read in Arrian and Curtius.¹ Most of the hides were made of goat skin but lamb skin was also used. The skins were specially prepared by closing the openings with airtight seams. By a special tanning process, the skins remained usable for at least three years. In the ethnographic material, the hides were not filled with grass, but were inflated, enabling a swimmer to cross the river, or they could be attached to one another under a frame, making floating rafts called *keleks* that could be used as transports. Inflated hides were also used in the making of the pontoon bridge.

Rollinger discusses earlier research on the subject and points out that this difference has been ignored or explained in an unsatisfactory manner. He questions the effectiveness of hides filled

with grass in crossing a river. The method would ruin the hides for their original use in protecting the tents, and furthermore there is scant evidence in the ethnographic material – no wonder, as the method is impractical when applied to larger groups of soldiers. In Xenophon's *Anabasis*, the Greeks serving Cyrus are said to have once used tent tarpaulins filled with hay to cross the river to get food and then to get back. But this operation obviously only involved a group of men, whereas in Alexander's case the whole army is said to have been transported by this method. Interestingly, Xenophon also mentions an unfulfilled plan concerning the transportation of the entire army: local cattle would be slaughtered to make inflatable hides, which would be connected to one another to make a pontoon bridge. This last plan was obviously based on local know-how and it is in line with ethnographic information. In fact, Arrian directly mentions Xenophon as a role model. It is plausible that Arrian was also influenced by Xenophon's description of the use of hides. How then did Arrian and Curtius come to their concept of the use of hides? Rollinger states that they probably did not have a clear idea of what the floatation aids were like.

Next, Rollinger discusses the floatation aids in Ancient Near Eastern evidence from Assyrian reliefs and cuneiform texts. The first known use of inflated hides is from the period of Assurnasirpal II (r. 883–859 B.C.) depicted in the palace at Nimrud, showing three men swimming in the Euphrates escaping the Assyrian troops who are shooting arrows at them in 878 B.C. Rollinger interprets the scene as Kudurru, the governor of Suhu, swimming freely and two men accompanying him. (This picture has also been interpreted as three natives seeking refuge, the one shot by arrows who does not have the inflated skin probably being dead.²) Furthermore, Assurnasirpal is shown crossing the Euphrates with his war chariot in a boat while the men are swimming using inflated hides. Detailed images show an Assyrian soldier preparing a hide and filling it with air and finally swimming across the river lying on the inflated hide. The author gives a large collection of pictures, also showing the transportation of goods using a *kelek* and fishermen sitting on the inflated hides. The material shows two types of inflated hides, the smaller made of goat or lamb skins, which only support the upper part of the body of the swimmer, and the larger ones made of cowhide enabling a sitting position. Rollinger then compares this information with the rich ethnographic evidence from the Near East and Central Asia. This evidence shows that inflated hides were actually very handy to fill in and use. In cuneiform texts, the author discusses the difficulties in the definition of terms, concerning, for instance, the proper meaning of the word *maskuru*, which used to be interpreted as a floating hose, but is now rather being considered as a *kelek* or a *quffa*, a small round boat covered with animal skins.

The question of what the crossing of the great rivers meant in the ruler's self-representation is also intriguing. The Tanais (Iaxartes) and Danube represented the bordering rivers at the ends of the world, and by crossing them Alexander took the role of being a world ruler. Here, Rollinger refers to the Achaemenids and to Darius I and discusses what the crossing of the great rivers meant in their empire building. This topic is interesting and though it has been discussed elsewhere, some elaboration here would have been useful. So, naturally, Alexander had made plans for the crossing

¹ This evidence comes mainly from the area with few trees in the Near East and Central East and mainly from the 19th and 20th centuries.

² M.-C. De Graeve, *The Ships of the Ancient Near East (c.2000–500 B.C.)*, [Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 7], Leuven 1981, 39.

of rivers, but this is very much hidden in the work of Arrian and Curtius, who turn the crossings into a vehicle with which they praise his genius for his quick solutions. Alexander's deeds have been presented as reflecting the overwhelming technical and military capacity of the Macedonian army, yet we need to see them in the long line of pioneering techniques ranging from the Ancient Near East and the Neo-Assyrian kings to Alexander and Late Antiquity. In this, not only hides, but also rafts and pontoon bridges must be taken into account. It was through Alexander's campaigns that people in the west learned more about these techniques and Rollinger offers a number of interesting observations on the campaigns of Hannibal, Scipio, Lucullus, Caesar and the Emperor Julian.

This skilfully written book offers many interesting insights. Rollinger knows all the sources, raises important questions and gives credible answers to them. There is an extensive bibliography and indexes of persons, places and text passages. There is also a substantial section of illustrations.

Christa Steinby

JULIA L. SHEAR: *Polis and Revolution. Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2011. ISBN 978-0-521-76044-7. XV, 368 pp. GBP 60, USD 99.

Julia L. Shear's *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens* is an insightful analysis of Athens' evolving reactions to its oligarchic coups. Shear rightly observes that the city's responses to its successive oligarchies should be considered together, rather than as independent and unrelated events, as they often are. Treating them thus sheds a great deal of light Athens' understanding of its own democratic identity and function. As argued by Shear, these reactions helped the city define the role and nature of democracy and a good democratic citizen, alongside the rituals used to reinforce this role on a civic level. These events also inspired dramatic reinterpretations of Athens' past, and even reshaped the city physically, inspiring epigraphic and architectural changes. Shear's work contributes to a conversation on active remembrance and the construction of collective memory, for example Michael Jung's *Marathon und Plataea: Zwei Perserschlächten als "lieux de mémoire" im antiken Griechenland*, and her wide-ranging approach gathers social, literary, and material evidence impressively. Given the broad nature of the study and the evidence it uses, some of the arguments are stronger than others. For example, while there is no doubt that Thucydides focuses on individual culpability, as do contemporary legal speeches, there is less evidence that, as Shear argues, Thucydides' text was directly influenced by forensic speeches (65) rather than simply by discussions and attitudes "in the air" at the time. Other points are more convincing, however, and one of the more interesting threads in Shear's monograph is the various regimes' tug-of-war over the city's history as its semi-mythical founders are reinterpreted and reimagined to support the stance of each consecutive government, each group attempting to create the appearance of legitimacy through continuity with the past. The discussions of the city's physical nature are also fascinating, for example the growing physical presence of the laws in the *agora*, and the reading of the Athenians' behavior in these years as an active struggle over the physical manifestation of the city's identity and understanding of its own past. Shear does an excellent job of painting a picture of the physical space of Athens and analyzing its significance, an important perspective that often eludes those of us